

Appl. No. 10/663,416  
Reply to Office Action of 08/01/2008

Page 10

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In reply to the Office Action mailed August 1, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance. In the Office Action, all of the pending claims 1-9 and 30-38 in the application have been rejected for anticipation. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 30, herein. Claims 10-29 remain withdrawn. Claims 1-9 and 30-38 remain pending.

This invention relates to a catalyst for making high octane gasoline out of cheaper building blocks, butanes and butenes, by a process of alkylation. One of the more desirable gasoline alkylation catalysts is hydrofluoric acid (HF). One problem with the use of HF as an alkylation catalyst is that it is corrosive and it is toxic to human beings. Anhydrous HF is typically a gas at normal atmospheric conditions which can pose an inhalation risk if it is inadvertently exposed to the atmosphere. Although the safety record associated with most HF based alkylation units is very good, the potential exists for inadvertent release of HF into the atmosphere. The present catalyst composition of a polymer holding the acid component in place can enable continued safe production of high octane gasoline from cheaper materials.

Claims 1-9 have been rejected for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by US 2001/0024755 A1 (the "Bahar publication"). The Bahar publication teaches microporous membranes containing polymeric electrolytes in the pores of the membrane for lithium cells. The "solid polymeric electrolytes" are packed into the pores of the polymeric porous film. Bahar, ¶ 0005.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the composition of acid and polymer is in a reactor. Support for this amendment is found among other places at page 10, lines 11-14 and page 11, lines 16-19 in the original disclosure. No new matter is added.

No teaching or suggestion is provided in the Bahar publication for placing the claimed composition in a reactor. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and

Appl. No. 10/663,416  
Reply to Office Action of 08/01/2008

Page 11


withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and at least for the same reasons, the claims 2-9 depending from claim 1.

Claims 30-38 have also been rejected for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by the Bahar publication. Applicants have amended claim 30 to recite that the composition of acid and polymer is pourable. Support for this amendment is found at page 12, lines 8-10. No new matter is added.

The Bahar publication teaches that the disclosed polymeric electrolytes are "solid". Bahar, ¶ 0005. The solid polymeric electrolytes can be placed into the pores only after being mixed "with a solution or dispersion" after which placement the solvent is removed. Id. ¶ 0091. No teaching or suggestion in the Bahar publication indicates a pourable composition of polymeric electrolyte. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 and at least for the same reasons, the claims 31-38 depending from claim 30.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims 1-9 and 30-38 pending in the subject application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if these remarks are not sufficient to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James C. Paschall  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,887  
(847) 391-2355 (phone)  
(847) 391-2387 (fax)

JCP/gm